

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

CEDRIC GREENE,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

No. 4:25-cv-00666-NCC

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Cedric Greene has filed a civil complaint against San Diego County, and he has filed an application seeking leave to proceed in forma pauperis. The Court will deny the application and dismiss this case for lack of proper venue.

I. Facts and Background

Since March 5, 2025, Greene has filed more than 20 cases pro se and in forma pauperis in this Court. To date, the cases that have been screened have been dismissed preservice for reasons including want of jurisdiction, lack of venue, and a finding of maliciousness. And Greene has a history of abusing the judicial process in other federal courts. In 2016, the Supreme Court of the United States found that Greene had “repeatedly abused” its process, and directed its clerk to refuse to accept future in forma pauperis petitions from Greene in noncriminal matters. *See In re Greene*, 578 U.S. 974 (2016). In January 2024, the United States Court of Federal Claims determined that “Greene’s abuse of the judicial system precludes him from proceeding IFP in this court.” *Greene v. U.S.*, 169 Fed. Cl. 334, 339 (2024), *appeal dismissed*, No. 2024-1475, 2024 WL 2239024 (Fed. Cir. May 17, 2024). The Court of Federal Claims estimated that Greene had filed more than three hundred cases in federal courts across the country. *Id.* Other federal circuit and district courts

have imposed filing restrictions on Greene. *See Greene v. Sprint Nextel Corp.*, 750 F. App'x 661, 666 & n.3 (10th Cir. 2018) (noting filing restrictions imposed on Greene in the Ninth and Tenth Circuit courts, as well as federal district courts in Kansas, Utah, California, and Nevada).

Greene instituted the instant action by filing a complaint against San Diego County. He provides a California address for himself and the Defendant. His allegations include being accused of “wrongfully practicing law” in San Diego County, and being denied entry into a courtroom. Doc. [1] at 5. He claims his constitutional rights were not protected in San Diego County court and he states he wants “to resolve matters here,” *id.* at 6, but he does not clearly describe any cognizable claim for relief.

II. Discussion

The Court first considers Greene’s application to proceed in forma pauperis. To discourage the filing of baseless litigation and conserve judicial resources, this Court has a duty to deny in forma pauperis status to those who have abused the judicial system. *See In re Sindram*, 498 U.S. 177, 180 (1991) and *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989). As discussed above, the United States Supreme Court, the Court of Federal Claims, and federal circuit and district courts have sanctioned Greene after finding he had abused the judicial process. Greene has now begun bombarding this Court with baseless litigation, and the instant case is no exception. The Court will therefore deny Greene’s application.

Additionally, venue clearly does not lie in this judicial district. Greene could bring this action in: (1) a judicial district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants reside in the state where the district is located; (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred; or (3) if there is no district in which an action may

otherwise be brought, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the Court's personal jurisdiction. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). None of those requirements are present here.

This Court must therefore dismiss this action, or if it is in the interests of justice, transfer it to any district in which it could have been brought. 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a). Transfer is not in the interests of justice because Greene is an abusive litigant, and there is no indication that he filed this case in a legitimate attempt to vindicate a cognizable right. The Court will therefore dismiss this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a). The Court cautions Greene to avoid abusing the judicial process in this judicial district.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Cedric Greene's Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs (ECF No. 2) is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice for lack of proper venue. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391, 1406(a).

Dated this 12th day of May 2025.



MATTHEW T. SCHELP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE